



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/401,382	09/22/1999	LIANG-HUA HSU	99-P-7818-US	4596

7590 06/16/2005

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

SHAH, SANJIV

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/401,382

Applicant(s)

HSU ET AL.

Examiner

Sanjiv D. Shah

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendments filed on 4/4/05
2. Claims 1-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 9, 18, 20, and 26 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-26 set forth non-functional descriptive material but fail to set forth physical structures or materials comprising of hardware or a combination of hardware and software within the technological arts (i.e. a computer) to produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result. For example, Claims 1, 7, and 9, the "system" reads on a mental construct/abstract idea or at best a computer program, per se. The language such as "static hyperlinking", "partial hyperlinking", "dynamic hyperlinking", "anchor generator", "semi-link generator", "source identifier", "link management", etc., does not clearly define structural elements and are not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium.

Claims 1-26 are interpreted as software per se, abstract ideas or mental construct and **not tangibly embodied on a computer** readable medium or hardware.

Furthermore, as defined by Applicant in the response filed on 2/23/04, claims 1-26 are directed to a system comprising a sequence of modules (page 12, 2nd paragraph). If the claimed terms "static hyperlinking", "partial hyperlinking", "dynamic hyperlinking", "anchor generator", "semi-link generator", "source identifier", "link management" are modules as defined by Applicant, the modules are software that are not necessarily embodied on a

Art Unit: 2176

computer(page 12, 2nd paragraph), therefore, claims 1-26 are still directed towards non-statutory subject matter and is not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium or hardware. An amendment stating a **system comprising a computer on which software modules are executed** would overcome the 101 rejection. **Similarly for method claims a method implemented on computer** would overcome the 101 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodkin et al. (USPN 6,092,074 - filing date: 02/1998) in view of Liu et al. (USPN 5,794,257 - filing date 08/1998), and further in view of Foss et al. (USPN 5,404,534 issued on 04/1995).

Regarding independent claim 1, Rodkin discloses:

A generalized automatic hyperlinking system comprising:

Art Unit: 2176

source-level partial hyperlinker (Rodkin on cot. 6, lines 15-35: teaches finding best destination address for linkage);

source-level dynamic hyperlinker (Rodkin on cot. 2, lines 42-58 and cot. 3, lines 26-34: teaches dynamic linking);

static hyperlinker for automatically generating static hyperlinks (Rodkin on cot. 2, lines 17-29 and lines 42-58: teaches static linking and also see Abstract and on cot. 3, lines 35-44 teaches automatically providing hypertext for character strings and control the destination of the previously static links).

However, Rodkin does not explicitly disclose, "intermediate links" and "incremental hyperlinker".

Liu et al. (Liu) on cot. 4, line 62- cot. 5, lines 4: teaches chain links (intermediate links) and on cot. 2, lines 6-14: teaches hyperlink incrementally.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Liu into Rodkin to provide a way to chain links and link incrementally, as taught by Liu, incorporated into the hyperlinking process of a document, as taught by Rodkin, in order to enhance the creation of hyperlinks in an automatic hyperlinking system.

However, Rodkin and Liu do not explicitly disclose "source identifier and a source anchor generator support the application of the incremental hyperlinker and the source-level dynamic hyperlinker on document objects at different hyperlinking stages".

Foss et al. (Foss) discloses a source identifier and a source anchor generator to support hyperlinking on col. 1, lines 39-44 teaches navigation links also called hypertext link

Art Unit: 2176

is a bridge between anchors; on col. 7, lines 30-53 and col. 8, lines 57-62 teaches source anchor identifier; on col. 5, lines 19-26 teaches managing a plurality of links, linking a plurality of anchors managed and manipulated by an anchor maker process (anchor generator to support hypertext links); and col. 12, lines 31-47 teaches source anchor. Furthermore, Foss on col. 5, lines 22-32 teaches the links and anchors are managed and manipulated as objects and have object types that define object operations for objects of the particular object types and on col. 6, lines 31-47 discloses link maker processes (different hyperlinking stages).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Foss into Rodkin and Liu to provide a way to manage a plurality of links by using source anchor identifier and anchor maker process, as taught by Foss, incorporated into the hyperlinking process, as taught by Rodkin and Liu, in order to facilitate the creation and management of links.

6. Claims 2-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodkin et al in view of Liu et al., and further in view of Foss et al., as applied above and further in view of Chang (USPN 5,694,594 - issued on 12/1997).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Rodkin, Liu, and Foss disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. Rodkin discloses:

wherein said source-level partial hyperlinker comprises: an initial semi-link generator (Rodkin on cot. 6, lines 15-35: teaches finding best destination address for linkage).

However, Rodkin do not explicitly disclose "link manager".

Chang on cot. 6, lines 25-51: teaches link manager.

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link manager, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. Chang discloses:

a link browser for interpreting hyperlinks that have been fully or partially generated (Chang on col. 3, line 62 - col. 4, line 7) teaches link browsing and on col. 6, lines 17-65: teaches all generated links are transferred to the link manager to be displayed to user's computer; the user reviews the contents of the links (link browsing by the user and when the links are displayed to the user they are interpreted as fully generated); and

a document browser (Chang on col. 3, line 62 - col. 4, line 7 teaches document browser).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link browser and document browser, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. However, Liu discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

an intermediate destination identifier (Liu on col. 4, line 62- col. 5, lines 4: teaches chain links (intermediate links) from identifying destination);

a destination identifier (Foss on col. 8, lines 57-62 teaches: destination anchor identifier).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Liu into Rodkin-Foss-Chang to provide a way to chain links and identifying the destination, as taught by Liu, incorporated into the hyperlinking process of a document, as taught by Rodkin-Foss-Chang, in order to enhance the creation of hyperlinks in an automatic hyperlinking system.

However, Rodkin, Liu, and Foss do not explicitly disclose "final link generator".

Chang on col. 6, lines 52-65: teaches final link generation.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide final link generation, as taught by Chang, incorporated into the hyperlinking process, as taught by Rodkin Liu-Foss in order to interactively complete the generation of links.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the claimed invention substantially as described supra. Liu discloses:

an intermediate anchor generator (Liu on col. 4, line 62- col. 5, lines 4: teaches generating chain links (intermediate links) which link my comprise anchor);

an intermediate link generator (Liu on col. 4, line 62- col. 5, lines 4: teaches generating chain links (intermediate links)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Liu into Rodkin-Foss-Chang to provide a way to generate chain links with anchors, as taught by Liu, incorporated into the hyperlinking process, as taught by

Art Unit: 2176

Rodkin-Foss-Chang in order to enhance the creation of hyperlinks in an automatic hyperlinking system.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the claimed invention substantially as described supra. Chang discloses:

a link database (Chang on col. 9, lines 50-56: teaches link database).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link database for storing links, as taught by Chang, incorporated into the hyperlinking process, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss which will provide an efficient hypertext system associating hypertext links with stored attributes.

Regarding independent claim 7, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the claimed invention substantially as described supra. Rodkin discloses: A generalized automatic hyperlinking system comprising:

an initial semi-link generator (Rodkin on col. 6, lines 15-35: teaches finding best destination address for linkage); and

a source identifier and a source anchor generator support hyperlinking (Foss on col. 1, lines 39-44 teaches navigation links also called hypertext link is a bridge between anchors; on col. 7, lines 30-53 and col. 8, lines 57-62 teaches source anchor identifier; on col. 5, lines 19-26 teaches managing a plurality of links, linking a plurality of anchors managed and manipulated by an anchor maker process (anchor generator to support hypertext links); and col. 12, lines 31-47 teaches source anchor).

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Foss into Rodkin-Liu-Chang to provide a way to manage a plurality of links by using source anchor identifier and anchor maker process, as taught by Foss, incorporated into the hyperlinking process, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Chang, in order to facilitate the creation and management of links.-

However, Rodkin-Liu-Foss do not explicitly disclose "link manager".

Chang on col. 6, lines 25-51 teaches link manager.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link manager, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the claimed invention substantially as described supra. However, Chang discloses:

a link browser for interpreting hyperlinks that have been fully or partially generated (Chang on col. 3, line 62 - col. 4, line 7: teaches link browsing and on col. 6, lines 17-65: teaches all generated links are transferred to the link manager to be displayed to user's computer; the user reviews the contents of the links (link browsing by the user and when the links are displayed to the user they are interpreted as fully generated); and a document browser (Chang on col. 3, line 62 - col. 4, line 7: teaches document browser). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link browser and document browser, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by

Art Unit: 2176

Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding independent claim 9, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. However, Foss discloses: A generalized automatic hyperlinking system comprising: a source identifier and a source anchor generator support hyperlinking (Foss on col. 1, lines 39-44 teaches navigation links' also called hypertext link is a bridge between anchors; on col. 7, lines 30-53 and col. 8, lines 57-62 teaches source anchor identifier; on col. 5, lines 19-26 teaches managing a plurality of links, linking a plurality of anchors managed and manipulated by an anchor maker process (anchor generator to support hypertext links); and col. 12, lines 31-47 teaches source anchor). an intermediate destination identifier (Liu on col. 4, line 62- col. 5, lines 4: teaches chain links (intermediate links) from identifying destination);

a destination identifier (Foss on col. 8, lines 57-62 teaches: destination anchor identifier).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Liu into Rodkin-Foss-Chang to provide a way to generate chain links with anchors, as taught by Liu, incorporated into the hyperlinking process, as taught by Rodkin-Foss-Chang in order to enhance the creation of hyperlinks in an automatic hyperlinking system.

However, Rodkin, Liu, and Foss do not explicitly disclose "final link generator". Chang on col. 6, lines 52-65: teaches final link generation.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide final link generation, as

Art Unit: 2176

taught by Chang, incorporated into the hyperlinking process, as taught by Rodkin Liu-Foss in order to interactively complete the generation of links.

However, Rodkin, Liu, and Foss do not explicitly disclose "link manager".

Chang on col. 6, lines 25-51: teaches link manager.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link- manager, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the claimed invention substantially as described supra. However, Liu discloses:

an intermediate anchor generator (Liu on col. 4, line 62- col. 5, lines 4: teaches generating chain links (intermediate links) which link my comprise anchor);

an intermediate link generator (Liu on cot. 4, line 62- cot. 5, lines 4: teaches generating chain links (intermediate links)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Liu into Rodkin-Foss-Chang to provide a way to generate chain links with anchors, as taught by Liu, incorporated into the hyperlinking process, as taught by Rodkin-Foss-Chang in order to enhance the creation of hyperlinks in an automatic hyperlinking system.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 11, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the claimed invention substantially as described supra. However, Chang discloses "link manager":

Chang on cot. 6, lines 25-51: teaches link manager.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link manager, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the claimed invention substantially as described supra. However, Chang discloses:

a link database (Chang on cot. 9, lines 50-56: teaches link database).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link database for storing links during the automatic hyperlinking process of a document which will provide an efficient hypertext system associating hypertext links with stored attributes.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the claimed invention substantially as described supra. However, Rodkin discloses: . an initial, intermediate, and final semi-link generator (Rodkin on cot. 6, lines 15-35: teaches finding best destination address for linkage to generate linkable character string).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. Chang discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

a link browser for interpreting hyperlinks that have been fully or partially generated (Chang on cot. 3, line 62 - cot. 4, line 7: teaches link browsing and on cot. 6, lines 17-65: teaches all generated links are transferred to the link manager to be displayed to user's computer; the user reviews the contents of the links (link browsing by the user and when the links are displayed to the user they are interpreted as fully generated)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link browsing, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. Chang discloses:

a document browser (Chang on cot. 3, line 62 - cot. 4, line 7: teaches document browser),

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a document browser, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by

Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. However, Rodkin, Foss, and Chang do not explicitly disclose "link interpreter".

Liu on col. 2, lines 65-67: teaches link interpreter.

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Liu into Rodkin-Foss-Chang to provide a link interpreter, as taught by Liu, incorporated into the hyperlink generation system, as taught by Rodkin-Foss - Chang, in order to perform proper actions when user clicks on a hyperlink.

Regarding independent claim 18, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. Chang discloses:

Chang discloses "a document browser for viewing and following links from one document to another" on col. 3, line 62- col. 4, line 7 allows the user to browse through hypermedia documents wherein each hypermedia document with have link that will to another document. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link browser and document browser, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Regarding independent claim 20, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. However, Liu discloses:

identifying an intermediate destination based on user-defined criteria (*Liu* on cot. 4, line 62- cot. 5, lines 4: teaches chain links (intermediate links) from identifying destination and on cot. 3, lines 9-38 teaches the user can be involved in the creation of hyperlinked manuals and on cot. 7, lines 34-36 teaches user defined tags);

Art Unit: 2176

identifying a destination based on user-defined criteria (Foss on col. 8, lines 57-62 teaches: destination anchor identifier and on col. 19, lines 20-34 teaches a link record with fields that shows the destination anchor of the link).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified *Liu* into Rodkin-Foss-Chang to provide a way to chain links and identifying the destination, as taught by *Liu*, incorporated into the hyperlinking process of a document, as taught by Rodkin-Foss-Chang, in order to enhance the creation of hyperlinks in an automatic hyperlinking system.

Regarding claims 17, 19, and 21-25, the limitations of claims 17, 19, and 21- 25 are a method for processing in the system of claims 2 -16 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 26, Rodkin, Liu, Foss, and Chang disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. Chang discloses:

a link browser invoking the means for link interpretation for determining actions to be taken when a link is selected (Chang on col. 3, line 62 - col. 4, line 7: teaches link browsing and on col. 6, lines 17-65: teaches all generated links are transferred to the link manager to be displayed to user's computer; the user reviews the contents of the links. Furthermore, Chang teaches that the user selects a link icon and reviews its contents to determine if the link's parameters needs to be changed (col. 6, lines 52-58)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chang into Rodkin-Liu-Foss to provide a link browser and document browser, as taught by Chang, incorporated into hyperlink generation system, as

Art Unit: 2176

taught by Rodkin-Liu-Foss, in order to facilitate the user to interactively and dynamically perform link generation.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 4/4/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments regarding claim 20, 112 2nd rejection is withdrawn.

Applicant argues that claims 1-26 being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 is improper. Examiner disagrees. Even though claims are directed to system and method claims, all the steps performed can be performed without computer. Therefore the claims are not limited to practical application. They are mere abstract ideas or computer program per se without limitation to tangible medium. As suggested the rejection can be overcome by adding limitation like "A computer implemented system or method" or by adding pre-processing or post processing activities.

As per claim 1, applicant argues that static link as shown is not automatically generated link as claimed. Examiner disagrees. Specifically, the broadest reasonable interpretation is that all links are computer generated and therefore considered automatically generated. The claimed invention is not limited by step of generating links that are different from general link generation. Therefore applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant further argues that examiner failed to provide logical connection for tying together the references as claimed in claim 1. Examiner disagrees. Specifically the cited references teaches the claimed limitations. As recited in body of rejection proper motivation is provided to connect references. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to connect the known techniques since they are in same technological area. In response to applicant's

Art Unit: 2176

argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation is properly provided in the body of the rejection.

As per claim 18, applicant argues that Chang fails to teach document browser but rather teaches user browsing document on network. The difference between document browser and user browsing document is not understood from applicant's arguments. Documents are browsed and is taught by Chang. Therefore applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

As per claim 26, applicant argues that Chang fails to teach "link browser invoking the means for link interpretation for determining actions to be taken". The broadest reasonable interpretation of the limitation is that link when selected opens the link document that is taught by Chang. Therefore applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sanjiv D. Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4098. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sanjiv D. Shah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176

S. Shah
June 10, 2005